

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
WY-GRSG-I-116750	ESL here we come!	There was a lot of hard work done to create the existing plan. Do not change it. On the other hand, go ahead... then we can have the Sage Grouse listed as Endangered and all oil/gas extraction and ranching on BLM could be ended! Brilliant!
WY-GRSG-I-116751	Greater Sage Grouse WY	After all the effort that went into creating the core areas for sage grouse, you seriously plan on throwing all that out the window? What has changed since those core sage grouse areas were created? Have sage grouse numbers risen so much you don't think those protected areas are important anymore? Even Gov Mead said oil and gas needed to be cautious, rather than drilling wherever they wanted and risk getting the sage grouse listed. If you take that language away from the core areas,the BLM, the oil and gas industry, along with this administration is opening the door for a future listing. But, you know what, maybe that's finally what needs to happen. You people can do whatever you want on the core areas, drop sage grouse numbers so low that they'll be listed, then you can go ahead and just shut everything down to oil and gas. Then the State of WY, and the oil and gas industry will really have something to cry about.
WY-GRSG-I-148282	Sugestions	<p>Laurel Telford Also hundreds of petition signers 260 West Canyon Street PO Box 12 Randolph, Utah Phone: 435-757-4807 email: pillowgrande@yahoo.com</p> <p>BLM Attn: Greater Sage-Grouse EIS 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009</p> <p>To Whom it may concern: Also to whomever will seriously consider these comments.</p> <p>I am happy to see efforts to put control to the states management, with some reservation.</p> <p>The area I am going to talk about is the Crawford Mountains in South West Wyoming and North East Utah then East to the Bear River Divide encompassing the Bear River drainage. The states line run diagonally through the Crawford's, with Wyoming of course being on the East side and taking up the larger portion. I have spent 60 plus years becoming familiar with this area.</p> <p>It has been recognized that the Bear River Divide is the most Eastern point of the Great Basin but yet Wyoming is considered in a different management zone which doesn't follow protocol.</p> <p>As I'm sure you're aware when the states areas were determined the planners laid down a ruler and drew straight lines and determined the areas of the states out west, unlike those in the Eastern part of the Nation where state lines followed obvious geographical features such as rivers and mountain ranges. The area I am talking about for all reasons should be under one management, even though this area is of one obvious likeness there are two field offices in control with most often opposing view points. There has been an agreement that Wyoming manage the grazing permittee's but for any other concern Utah controls it's portion. Almost the whole of the area is critical Deer Winter range habitat. Both Utah and Wyoming claim the Deer that Winter there and are at loggerheads about the hunting issues. During the last two Winters, (2017 Utah and 2018 Wyoming) Utah BLM and Wyoming BLM have been out in the Deer Winter range doing Mastication's and Juniper pile burning even though no one else is supposed to be there.</p> <p>In 2011 an EIS justified mowing down Sagebrush to prevent "catastrophic fire from reaching Woodruff and Randolph. After pointing out the fallacy this wording has since been deleted from the original EIS. They then proceeded to Masticate Junipers and two years later we had prolific growth of Black Henbane and Musk Thistle which continues even though they (Salt Lake Field Office) give Rich County 20-25 thousand a year for weed control..</p> <p>The Interior Departments management cry at the moment is restoration of Sage Grouse Habitat, it was concluded that the Sagebrush was in peril and it was necessary to cut down Juniper even on steep hillsides in some areas although the area is not conducive to Sagebrush growth. We also have minuscule encroachment opposed to what is claimed. We have sent hundreds of petition signatures to the Salt Lake City BLM Field Office and also to the BLM Kemmerer Field Office from people that are familiar with this area opposing the ongoing Mastication and elimination of the Juniper.</p>

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
		<p>Sage Grouse Habitat Restoration is not going to be accomplished by cutting Juniper, lets have true, real Habitat Restoration. I can remember in the 1950's when the Grouse was prolific, so what has changed? We are DRIER! I am not blaming man but it is drier, we have lost many of our springs and our meadows where the Sage Grouse chicks could get small grasses, forbes and bugs. If we want RESTORATION we must restore our meadows. We can put pipes into our dried up springs and using small solar panels once again put moisture back on our meadows. We can also utilize the existing developed water resources the cattlemen use in the summer and make it Sage Grouse friendly and available which it isn't at the present time. I worked for many years keeping the water supplied to the cattle so I know it can be done. So called guzzlers are very expensive and are not the answer because Sage Grouse don't like to go down to the water level where they can't see if there's a predator. Spring restoration would be much more cost effective.</p> <p>If we didn't penalize holding over budgets for more than one year it would be helpful. Putting the control back to not only the States but to the local citizens, the ones that frequent the area and are knowledgeable. Those that think up the projects never have to stare at the results of their decisions, another issue is acronyms, please quit hiding behind the acronyms, speak in plain language, not convoluted so that we forget what the subject is by the end of the paragraph. The following do not cause less Sage Grouse Habitat.</p> <p>Petroleum exploration Pipelines Cattle Grazing The lack of Sage Brush (There is no lack) Inadvertent Lek proximity Words of wisdom by Henri Poincare: Science is made up of facts as a house is of bricks but a group of facts is no more science than a pile of bricks is a house. Feel free to quote or use any part you would like including my name.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-210075	General Comment	<p>We do need greater recognition of the role of the state in species management in Wyoming. Our Game and Fish manage the wildlife and I feel that they should have priority role in species management. They are already managing it so why do we need someone else to tell them how to manage it? The focus should be on alignment with state plans. States can have the plans there and they manage the wildlife. If there is a designation of a threatened or listed species, they can adjust management on endangered species easier than they can in Washington. If current livestock grazers meet land health standards while maintaining the habitat, there is no need to analyze alternatives for renewal of a grazing permit. If there is already management and no changes, there may not be any fine tuning needed at that point. In the removal of requirement for the BLM assessment for potential risk from existing structural range improvements, it all depends on what structural range improvement is. If it is similar to those listed in the proposal, it would not be threat and could be an improvement for the species. It is all site specific. One size doesn't fit all. As far as the clarification on grazing management for forages and grasses, such as with the sage grouse, you are managing for more diversity. One size doesn't fit all. We need diversity to meet goals for both the species and our livestock. I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-210113	General Comment	<p>I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative. I am a rancher in southern Wyoming and northwest Colorado with significant populations of sage grouse. Some implementations of the regulatory side make absolutely no sense. There seems to be no understanding that many of the grasses never reach the 7" height. Our grouse numbers indicate that it isn't a criteria. Predator control especially on ravens is critical. State management plan are going to be more effective than a federal one, that's absolutely clear. Our experience with having significant wildlife populations in conjunction with livestock activity is absolute.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-210114	General Comment	<p>I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative. The plan needs to mirror the Wyoming's plan that has been successful for 12-15 years. I would just like them to come up with a federal plan that mirrors and helps Wyoming's state plan with its record of success.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-215197	Opposition to the the WY_GRSG Draft RMPA_EIS	<p>I am opposed to the the WY_GRSG Draft EMPA_EIS for the following reasons: it degrades efforts already put forth by the state of Wyoming for conservation of the greater sage-grouse, and it opens up habitats essential for survival of the species to fragmentation. The RMPA_EIS also tilts the management of greater sage-grouse habitat in favor of energy development industries.</p> <p>Prioritization of leasing- Mangement Objective 14- removes protections for GHMA"... priority would be given to leasing and development of fluid mineral resources... outside of PHMA." GHMAs are protected as they allow for a burrfer zone around the PHMA and provide protections to habitat that is already fragmented. Removing protections from the GHMA would allow for further degradation of an already limited habitat.</p>

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
WY-GRSG-I-215582	Sage grouse must be protected	Wildlife diversity, specifically the sage grouse, is more important, and valuable, in the long term, than the other resources that might be recovered in their habitat, and so are worth the small cost of taking the precautions already being undertaken to protect them. Stop prioritizing short-term temporary gain for a few already rich people over the long term gain of everyone, and continue to protect the sage grouse.
WY-GRSG-I-216363	Opposition to Plan Revisions to Roll-back existing protections	<p>As someone who cares about birds and the places they need, and as a professional biologist who spent their entire 35+ year career in conservation science, I strongly oppose any efforts to weaken the conservation protections in the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) sage-grouse land management plans. These birds are part of an iconic western ecosystem, the sagebrush habitat, which supports over 350 species including Golden Eagles and mule deer. They are an important part of our heritage.</p> <p>In 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) determined that the Greater Sage-Grouse populations were in serious trouble and warranted protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).</p> <p>An unprecedented numbers of stakeholders across the West worked for many years on ensuring that sage-grouse management is based on science and good for our local economies. The plans that were agreed to in 2015 led the FWS to reverse its 2010 decision and find the future for sage-grouse was secure: a historic victory for conservation and for collaboration.</p> <p>Instead of amending the plans by weakening protections, pointedly prioritizing oil and gas development over protected species, BLM should focus on engaging communities in the decisions necessary to implement the plans as they are. Give the plans a chance to work. The recently issues Instruction Memoranda generally retreat from the protections set out in previous guidance to field staff in 2016. The first IM, issued in December 2017, reverses existing policy, directing BLM field offices to prioritize oil and natural gas leasing and drilling projects outside of the most sensitive sage grouse habitat. Instead, it states that BLM "does not need to lease and develop outside of [grouse] habitat management areas before considering any leasing and development within [grouse] habitat." The second IM, issued in January 2018, eliminates requirements for public notice and comment "when conditions worsen and there is a need for action" under adaptive management provisions in the grouse plans. It also shortens the public protest period for oil and gas lease sale parcels to 10 days from 30 days</p> <p>If there are any changes that experts deem necessary, these should instead be done via minor plan amendments, also known as "maintenance actions." A complete rewrite is an unnecessary waste of federal resources, and risks upending the official finding made by the FWS that a listing under the ESA is not needed.</p> <p>These federal management plans must keep key elements that biologists believe are necessary to avoid the need for listing the species under the ESA. Specifically:</p> <p>Development on existing leases should be managed per regulations that are currently in place, which limit surface occupancy and disturbance. Years of research leave no doubt that sage-grouse do not do well in close proximity to energy development. More development in the most important habitat will not help conserve the species.</p> <p>Good mitigation policy and practice is one of the best opportunities to achieve sustainable development and conservation goals. Where impacts cannot be avoided or minimized, well-designed compensatory mitigation programs can achieve the multiple-use, sustained yield objectives.</p> <p>Do not strip the fundamental mitigation goal of "net conservation gain" from the plans. A no net loss of habitat merely prevents additional habitat loss and is not adequate to achieve long-term conservation of sage-grouse.</p> <p>Improve plan monitoring and oversight, including providing training to field staff and the necessary incentives to ensure proper implementation. The plans should contain metrics by which conservation success can be measured. Conservation metrics will help in effective management of the habitat and reduce wasting personnel time and limited funds.</p> <p>The plans contain many new provisions that serve as loopholes and exceptions to habitat protections. We need certainty that crucial habitat will be protected to ensure the species thrives into the future. If the revisions are adopted, thousands of wells could move into the species core habitats, potentially leading to a listing of the species as endangered</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-216532	Please find the attached comments.	See attachment

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
WY-GRSG-I-216686	General Comment	My name is Rob Crofts and I am a rancher and federal land grazer in Fremont County, Wyoming. I graze cattle and sheep in critical grouse habitat. Grouse are part of our ranching operation every day. We have grouse winter, summer, spring and fall. They intermingle with cattle and other livestock. Private and state leases provide habitat. I work with BLM in grouse habitat management. This is a local level type issue that needs to have local influence on how it is formulated.
WY-GRSG-I-216687	General Comment	I am Involved with Padlock Ranch in northern Wyoming and southern Montana. There are sage grouse leks on part of our range. If ranchers aren't allowed to manage these we can't allow the federal government to do so. They have failed to manage other species. As an example, the feral horse situation has been a disaster. Locals need to have more say in how these species are managed since we are the ones who see these species everyday as opposed someone who only sees them every 6 months. We manage our range for better management for our livestock as well as other wildlife that co-exist with us.
WY-GRSG-I-216688	General Comment	I ranch and farm in Wyoming. I decided to comment because I see this as a property rights issue more than anything else, a taking without compensation. Whoever wants the grouse on allotments should have the decency to rent property and compensate land owners for using their property for housing these grouse. I encourage you to quit delaying process that they might be threatened or endangered I encourage you to make that decision right now and lease property from rightful land owners or list as endangered and compensate them anyway. Federal has no power, they do not fall under migratory. I do not know why the federal government is involved. List the thing and start with compensation.
WY-GRSG-I-216689	Undefined	I am farmer in Park County, Wyoming. I have been there over 60 years with grouse all around. Other groups have researched mitigation and predation. It is really eye opening. We need to recognize then role of the states in all of these plans. States have firsthand experience and knowledge. Align federal/ state plans. The 7 in standard for the habitat is a high standard. I would like to know if habitat criteria are standards or suggestions. If the current livestock grazing is meeting standards while meeting grouse criteria, why is there a need to review these. This is pointless and time consuming. Net conservation gain is a nebulous term that indicates a never-ending cycle. Gain and gain and gain, that term should be changed for clarity. States recognize de minimus activities not affecting sage grouse. The government needs to reconfigure that in these plans. Grouse should not be listed. I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative.
WY-GRSG-I-216692	General Comment	I am a public and private lands rancher in the southeast corner of Wyoming. I have been traveling the state working on other wildlife management plans for 20 years. I have watched this grouse plan morph out of control. This has made it extremely difficult for land users on both private and public lands. These ranchers are great stewards of their property. They have perspective and understanding of what the wildlife species need and how the livestock management is a tool to foster the land to the sage grouse's benefit. I think we need to allow the states a bigger part in managing these species. It is our backyard and I feel very strongly about that. I think the standard for grass height to be 7 inches is way off the mark. These animals are developing in habitats that are grazed, allowing them to see predators from a greater distance if there is less standing forage. Habitat objectives are not standards. I think they are very subjective and it is hard to mark that progress of meeting that standard when it is a moving target. I think the land health standards are pretty good, I do not think you need to reanalyze those for the renewal of a grazing permit. There is always going to be variations in climate and weather and I think those swings need to be minimized in that analysis. The BLM should defer to state wildlife management plans and defer to the mitigation plans that the state has put in place. I think clarification of riparian area management grazing of forbs and grasses needs to have a comparative analysis made that levels that playing field. I think the SFA's should be eliminated. I think if these changes are implemented, they have better impacts for these ag economies, especially in local communities and certainly for grazing community and their ability to drive economies. We need common sense on this. I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative.
WY-GRSG-I-216693	General Comment	I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative. Wildlife should be managed by the state. The harder land health has been pushed, the less sage grouse there is due to changes in nature and the range. There is a lot of predation on sage grouse, increasing every year. The sage grouse scatter out to get away from eagles and other avian predators. The main thing about predators is livestock producers are paying predator fee for predator control and so that needs to be recognized. It is not the agencies that are paying for control, it's the livestock people. The state could work with the livestock people better than the federal agencies can. Sage grouse management needs to be under the state's control.
WY-GRSG-I-216694	General Comment	I support the adoption of the BLM draft RMP amendments. Wyoming's success in managing nearly all aspects of activity in the state generally and sage grouse core area specifically clearly demonstrates that the amendments greater recognition of the role of the states in managing wildlife species is appropriate. The BLM's decisions should focus on alignment with state plans. Proposed BLM deference to state mitigation plans is equally appropriate. The removal of the requirement of BLM assessment of the potential risk of sage grouse from existing structural arrangement improvements in general management habitat areas is another appropriate change from both a range and sage grouse management perspective as well as recognition of the fundamental principle of administrative

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
		procedure. As to the adaptive management working group, the makeup of the membership of this group should be specified and their authority and responsibilities made clear. I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative.
WY-GRSG-I-216695	General Comment	I am a rancher from Laramie area in Wyoming and I am in favor of the plan changes. These are an improvement to the 2015 plan amendments. The thing I am most encouraged by that its going back to the states. Removal of 7 in standard is good and I never felt like that was a benefit to the sage grouse or a benefit to the range. Maintaining that will cause negative effects to the soil. Through our range land management that we”ve done over the last 35 years, we have benefitted both livestock grazing and wildlife species. The interaction of the cattle on the land supports insects. This is especially a benefit to sage grouse chicks. I am in favor of these RMP amendments.
WY-GRSG-I-216696	General Comment	I think the BLM draft Wyoming management alignment alternative is great the way it is worded and these eliminations of the focal area sage brush area allows for alignment of management state core areas. Bringing stuff back to the state and removing the 7 inch stubble height is good. I just think it”s good. I support Alternative B over the No Action Alternative.
WY-GRSG-I-217082	Pathfinder Ranches, LLC	Pathfinder Ranches, LLC’s comments on the RMPA and EIS are attached.
WY-GRSG-I-217791	This new plan is Arbitrary and Capricious	<p>Secretary Zinke”s Order is Arbitrary and Capricious</p> <p>Years were spent in conducting scientific studies and in collaborating with State and Local Governments to complete the 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse plans for BLM and the USFS in Western States. What cost this additional, arbitrary and capricious re-planning effort? We would like an accounting of these additional costs.</p> <p>We are Frank and Karla Bird who reside in Pinedale Wyoming. Frank”s family settled in the Green River Valley of Wyoming in 1876. Frank has lived in Big Piney, the upper reaches of Southfork Cottonwood Creek while his father maintained and operated a sawmill there in 1952; and in Smoot, Jackson, Dubois, Worland and Pinedale, Wyoming. He has also lived and worked in Oregon and Alaska. Karla has lived and worked in Rock Springs, Rawlins and Worland, Wyoming, and also lived and worked in sagebrush habitats in California and Oregon.</p> <p>We recreate our lives regularly and routinely on public lands in the Western United States - we hike, fish, camp and hunt, sightsee, drive for pleasure, do photography and plein air painting on public lands managed by both BLM and USFS. As a boy in the 1940s and 1950s in Sublette County, Frank experienced hundreds upon hundreds of Greater Sage-grouse in scattered and grouped flocks in the verdant sagebrush. Fewer in the 1960s as a US Marine on leave to visit family. In the 2000”s and currently when Frank and Karla travel through these same areas, these massive flocks are gone. We watch and expect to see sagegrouse along the roads and we see fewer and fewer each year, in our several times a week visits to public lands. The 2015 Sagegrouse Management Plans were on-line and ready to begin to stop our losses.</p> <p>We know that other sagebrush dependent species are also in decline: Mule Deer, Pronghorn, Elk, and other sagebrush dependent birds. Only by proper and compensatory mitigative management of sagebrush habitats, will we retain and possibly recover these important species.</p> <p>On Page I-I of the May 2018 Draft RMP/EIS, the statement that “the Secretary of the Interior...issued Secretarial Order (SO) 3349. It ordered agencies to reexamine practices “to better balance conservation strategies and policies with the equally legitimate need of creating jobs for hard-working Americans families” “. We see no legitimate basis for this SO. FLMPA and the NFMA do not require a balancing of conservation with jobs. The Endangered Species Act does not require a balancing of conservation of species of concern with jobs. The NEPA does require a cost benefit analysis while analyzing alternative actions, but it does not require a decision that balances jobs for hard working Americans families with conservation and protection of habitats, just the consideration of the costs and benefits of each.</p> <p>We also believe that the Notice of Cancellation of BLM”s Application to withdraw SFA from locatable mineral entry is Arbitrary and Capricious. The 2015 EISs found that in order to protect and enhance Greater Sagegrouse that there was a threat from new locatable minerals development and that a withdrawal from mineral entry was warranted. To cancel this without NEPA analysis is Arbitrary and Capricious.</p> <p>We live in Wyoming and respect its Governor, but public lands on BLM and USFS lands are owned by all of the citizens of the United States, and not just the Governor. The Governor and his staff spent much time and effort to develop the core area concept, but his is not the law of this land. The laws and policies of federal lands apply. It is important that BLM and USFS continue to manage with sagebrush focal areas, else additional, usable sagebrush habitat will be continually impacted and lost over time.</p> <p>It is important that noise thresholds and monitoring outlined in EO 2015-4 are applicable to all leks, not just those inside PHMA/core, else additional, usable</p>

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
		<p>sagebrush habitat will be continually impacted and lost over time. It is not enough to focus only on core areas. We must bring back sagebrush dependent species in larger areas to compensate for what we have lost over time.</p> <p>Livestock Grazing: Please select the No Action Alternative - “Adequate Nesting Cover greater than or equal to 7 inches or as determined by ESD site potential and local variability.” The proposed change would eliminate consideration of a scientifically valid standard at the start. Adequate vegetation cover is necessary to protect nesting birds, nests, eggs, nestlings and young from sharp eyed predators. Adequate vegetation cover is necessary to protect chicks from predation as they seek water. Stomped out or overgrazed riparian areas, waterholes and springs make it difficult for chicks to survive the daily trip to get a drink of water - as they are easily seen by predators as they traverse open areas. Adequate vegetation cover is required to produce the bugs that the chicks rely on for survival as they grow. If you start with the concept that “we”ll figure out what the proper residual forage measurement is..” then it will never be studied nor monitored and arguments will continue while sagegrouse are lost.</p> <p>Terms and Conditions for Livestock Grazing must remain as indicated in the No Action Alternative. If impacts to sagebrush and sagegrouse occur it will be too late to recover Greater Sage-Grouse, especially since monitoring is routinely underfunded by Congress or not funded at all.</p> <p>We support the No Action Alternative for Compensatory Mitigation Strategies. We need a Net Conservation Gain because sagegrouse have lost so much already. If we only save the best of the best, we will continue to lose the rest. This will result in the Greater Sagegrouse as being listed as Threatened or Endangered in policy terms, but in real terms, we will lose an icon of the West when we lose sagebrush and Greater Sage-Grouse&hellip; and Mule Deer, and Pronghorn, and Elk and Burrowing Owls and Pygmy Rabbits and all the other species that rely on healthy sagebrush habitats for survival.</p> <p>We support the No Action Alternative for Fluid Mineral Leasing. Leasing should be prioritized outside of both PHMAs and GHMAs. As stated earlier, it is important to protect sagebrush and sagegrouse habitats everywhere they occur, not just in the core or priority areas. When money is accepted for a Fluid Mineral Lease a Right to access and extract that mineral is understood. It is not sufficient to say that, “Oh, we”ll analyze impacts at the Exploration and Development stages”, as the Right has precedence over restrictive measures if they preclude reasonable development. So, please develop the non-habitat areas first.</p> <p>We support the No Action Alternative for Sagebrush Focal Areas. And, they should be considered for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p> <p>We support the No Action Alternative for Modifying Habitat Management Area Designations. The Governor”s Core Areas are nice and they are interesting, but only relying on the Governor”s Core Areas for federal land management is contrary to federal law and will not recover and enhance sagebrush and dependent species habitats.</p> <p>Thank you for providing a lengthy opportunity for public comment. Since we are so frequently visiting public lands, it was difficult to find time to make the comments.</p> <p>Thank you for using e-Planning.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-217882	Abide by Wyoming's Plan for Sage Grouse	<p>Weakening the management plan developed by Wyoming for the preservation of sage grouse flies in the face of the science used to develop the plan. It’s a proven fact that sage grouse do not do well near oil an gas development. Do not adopt a plan which weakens the protections for the endangered sage grouse.</p>
WY-GRSG-I-217886	Undefined	<p>To the Department of the Interior:</p> <p>I am writing about the need for the Department of the Interior to follow Wyoming’s lead and keep the management plan developed in 2015 for the protection of sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Wyoming is Home to much of the sage-grouse population and we in the state have worked for several years to craft adequate protection’ for this important species. Please do not undermine with various loop holes all of the work which has been accomplished to ensure that this bird has adequate habitat going forward. The management plan of 2015 should not the weekend but, rather, should be strengthened.</p> <p>To those who do not live in Wyoming, sagebrush may appear to be of no value. However this habitat is absolutely critical to the survival of this unique and valuable creature.We need assurances that this essential habitat is protected so that the sage-grouse can survive well into the future.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Kathleen Moriarty, Ph.D.</p> <p>4536 Highway 156</p> <p>Torrington, Wyoming 82240</p>

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
WY-GRSG-I-218735	Comments from Friends of the Earth members	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 1 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218736	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (2)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 2 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218737	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (3)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 3 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218738	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (4)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 4 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218739	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (5)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 5 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218740	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (6)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 6 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218741	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (7)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 7 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218742	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (8)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 8 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218743	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (9)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 9 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218744	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (10)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 10 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218745	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (11)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 11 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218746	Comments from Friends of the Earth members (12)	On behalf of Friends of the Earth and our members and activists, I am submitting 30,170 comments. This is file 12 of 12.
WY-GRSG-I-218747	Greater Sage Grouse EIS	<p>I've just submitted a comment but it disappeared after I filled out the name & address! So, I'll make this short: Please follow the Wyoming Plan from 2015 & do NOT destroy all the collaborative work that was done to come up with a habitat-based approach. It is just wrong for Johnny-come-lately Zinke to try to claim that industry was not at the table. I attended many sessions in Western Wyoming and they had more seats than any other stakeholder. Stick with the Wyoming plan, it is based on science and compromise and those core areas are essential not just for sage grouse but also the other animals and plants that depend on some non-developed sage habitat. It is good science and respects the many people that contributed to that conclusion. --Thanks for your attention, I live here on the edge of the Powder River Basin and have seen 3 local leks disappear in the past 30 years after oil/gas boom and then wind farms. I hope you also got my longer, more detailed comment.</p> <p>--Maria Katherman Inez Wyoming 82633</p>
WY-GRSG-I-218755	Strengthen Protections for Sage-Grouse -- 2018 Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Draft Resource Management Plan	Please see attached comments.

Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Comment Submissions via ePlanning Web Form

Submission ID	Subject	Submission Text
	Amendment/Environmental Impacts Statement	
WY-GRSG-I-218886	Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts Comments	Please see attached. Bobbie Frank
WY-GRSG-I-218892	Comments from The Pew Charitable Trusts	Attached please find comments from The Pew Charitable Trusts on the draft environmental impact statement proposing changes to the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) 2015 sage-grouse plan in Wyoming.